Artificial Intelligence and Copyright: Legal Challenges and Emerging Standards

By Nicolle Lafosse – Of Counsel, Diaz Reus

Human Authorship as a Requirement for Copyright Protection

The foundation of copyright law in the United States continues to rest on the principle of human authorship. As AI-generated content proliferates across industries—from literature and visual art to music and even legal drafting—the U.S. Copyright Office has made clear its position: works produced solely by artificial intelligence without meaningful human input are not eligible for copyright protection.

In its most recent guidance, the Copyright Office reaffirmed that copyright attaches only to "original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression," and that originality must stem from human creativity. This has profound implications for businesses relying on AI tools to generate marketing materials, product descriptions, or even software code.

The Problem of Ownership in Hybrid Creations

Where AI is used as a tool under human direction—such as when a user gives creative prompts or makes editorial choices—there may be a path to partial or derivative protection. However, determining the threshold of human involvement remains a legal grey area. This creates uncertainty for companies investing heavily in AI systems, especially when evaluating their intellectual property portfolios or negotiating licensing agreements.

Courts are beginning to address this issue, but a standardized test or precedent has yet to be firmly established. Until then, companies and creators must tread carefully when seeking to register AI-assisted works or assert exclusivity over them.

Training AI with Copyrighted Material: Infringement or Innovation?

A rapidly growing legal battleground involves the datasets used to train generative AI models. These models often ingest vast amounts of copyrighted text, images, or audio from the internet, which raises significant concerns around unauthorized use.

Major litigation, including ongoing class actions against OpenAI and Meta, allege that training on copyrighted works—without permission or licensing—constitutes copyright infringement. Plaintiffs argue that their works are being repurposed to generate derivative content without compensation or attribution, undermining the market value of the original works.

Defendants counter that these uses fall under fair use, a complex and case-specific doctrine. Legal arguments hinge on whether the data is used for transformative purposes (e.g., improving an AI system) or if it merely exploits existing creative works to produce competing outputs.

Understanding Fair Use in the Context of AI

The four-factor fair use test is currently being reexamined in light of generative AI. These factors include:

1. **Purpose and character of the use** – Is the AI using the content for transformation or replication?
2. **Nature of the copyrighted work** – Is it highly creative, such as fiction, or more factual, like a database?
3. **Amount and substantiality used** – Is the AI ingesting entire works or snippets?
4. **Effect on the market** – Could AI-generated content replace or reduce demand for the original?

Courts have not yet reached consensus on how these factors apply when the user is not a person, but a machine learning model. Legal experts increasingly call for legislative guidance to address these ambiguities, as litigation alone cannot define a clear path forward.

Liability and Risk Exposure for Businesses Using AI

Companies that incorporate AI into their products or services must now consider whether the content generated exposes them to secondary liability. For example, a law firm that uses AI to generate client-facing content may unwittingly reproduce protected phrases, artistic elements, or proprietary formats.

Risk mitigation involves a combination of legal audits, AI vendor due diligence, and clear contractual language. Licensing agreements with AI providers should include warranties about the training data and indemnification provisions in case of third-party infringement claims.

There is also an emerging field of copyright insurance that may provide some protection, though its scope is still limited. Legal counsel must now integrate IP compliance into AI procurement and deployment strategies across sectors, especially in tech, finance, and media.

International Perspectives on AI and Copyright

While U.S. law remains anchored in human authorship, other jurisdictions are beginning to address AI-generated works differently. In the United Kingdom, for example, the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows protection for computer-generated works if there is no human author, assigning authorship to the person who undertook the arrangements necessary for creation.

In the European Union, recent draft legislation on AI liability and intellectual property suggests a more harmonized approach, but much remains in flux. Multinational organizations operating across borders must adapt to divergent legal frameworks and evolving regulatory standards.

Ethical Concerns and the Role of Consent

Beyond the strictly legal dimensions, the ethical debate surrounding AI and creativity is intensifying. Artists, writers, musicians, and visual creators have voiced frustration that their work is being scraped, repurposed, or synthesized into AI outputs without consent or recognition.

The right to be acknowledged as the originator of a work is enshrined in moral rights legislation in many countries, but not fully protected under U.S. copyright law. There is a growing call for transparency in AI training practices and stronger mechanisms for artists to opt in—or opt out—of datasets.

Ethical AI frameworks are also beginning to include principles of compensation and equitable value distribution, especially for underrepresented communities whose cultural assets may be mined by global AI systems.

Strategic Outlook for Legal Practitioners and Innovators

The legal field must now balance innovation with protection, opportunity with responsibility. Law firms, corporate legal departments, and public policy advocates will play a key role in defining how copyright law adapts—or fails to adapt—to the realities of algorithmic creativity.

Emerging policy proposals include creating new IP categories for machine-generated content, updating registration systems to capture human-AI collaboration, and imposing data transparency mandates on AI developers. These initiatives signal the beginning of a broader rethinking of how authorship, originality, and ownership are defined in the 21st century.

Toward a New Copyright Paradigm

As the capabilities of AI continue to evolve, copyright law faces a pivotal challenge: to preserve the value of human creativity without stifling technological progress. For legal professionals, the coming years will demand not only legal rigor, but also adaptability, interdisciplinary understanding, and a proactive approach to risk management.

Firms like Diaz Reus are uniquely positioned to advise clients navigating this legal frontier—helping them understand their rights, mitigate risks, and seize the opportunities that innovation presents.

References:
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). *Artificial Intelligence and Copyright*.
- Harvard Business Review. (2023).
- The Times. (2025). *In an AI world, we need copyright to preserve innovation*.

At Diaz Reus, we deliver global legal solutions with precision, discretion, and integrity.

Visit our website: www.diazreus.com

Follow us on social media: @diazreustarg